UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,047	06/21/2006	Jean-Louis Henri Dasseux	PC20667	1170

757 7590 09/30/2008

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1625	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,047	DASSEUX ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Taofiq A. Solola	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *34,36 and 56-69* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) *58-69* is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *36,56 and 57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *34* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on *26 May 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *na*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claims 34, 36, 56-59 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 36, 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to treating or preventing cardiovascular diseases, disorders capable of being treated or prevented by increasing HDL or decreasing LDL levels. These are not practical utilities under the US patent practice. To ascertain the practical utility, one must read the specification into the claims contrary to several precedent decisions by the US courts and Official practice. The claims are attempts by applicant to claim treatment of all diseases known today and that may be discovered in the future, by increasing HDL or decreasing LDL levels. Cardiovascular diseases embrace many diseases. They are reach-through claims and are no longer patentable under the US patent practice. A claim must stand alone to define the invention, and incorporation into the claims by reference to the specification or an external source is not permitted. Ex parte Fressola, 27 USPQ 2d 1608, BdPatApp & Inter. (1993). By deleting the terms the rejection would be overcome.

Claims 36, 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the claimed mechanisms and the diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

"'In the context of determining whether sufficient "utility as a drug, medicant, and the like in human therapy" has been alleged, It is proper for the examiner to ask for substantiating evidence unless one with ordinary skill in the art would accept the [compounds and the utilities] as obviously correct." *In re Jolles*, 628 F.2d 1327, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1980), citing *In re Novak*, 306 F.2d 924 (CCPA 1962); see 340 F.2d 974, 977-78 (CCPA 1965).

"A specification disclosure which contains a teaching of the manner and process of making and using the invention . . . must be taken as in compliance with the enabling requirement of the first paragraph of § 112 unless there is reason to doubt the objective truth of the statements contained therein which must be relied on for enabling support." *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995), Id. at 1566, quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 223 (CCPA 1971); *Fiers v. Revel,* 984 F.2d 1164, 1171-72 (Fed. Cir. 1993), quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d at 223; see also *Armbruster*, 512 F.2d 676, 677 (CCPA 1975); *Knowlton*, 500 F.2d 566, 571 (CCPA 1974); *Bowen*, 492 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1974); *Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 576 (CCPA 1973).

Where there is "no indication that one skilled in the art would accept without question [the instant compounds and method of use] and no evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the claimed products do have those effects *Novak*, 306 F.2d at 928, an applicant has failed to sufficiently demonstrate sufficient utility and therefore cannot establish enablement.'" *In re Rasmusson,* 75 USPQ2d 1297 (CAFC 2005). The claimed invention is not enabled without undue experimentation for the following reasons:

For rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC, 1988): "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the breadth of the claims, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, h) and, the quantity of experimentation necessary, *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex prate Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. The breadth of the claims includes many compounds. The nature of the invention is using the compounds as pharmaceuticals. There is no known prior art that broadly teaches treating or preventing cardiovascular diseases, disorders capable of being treated or prevented by increasing HDL or decreasing LDL levels.

According to the specification the compounds are for treating lipidemia. Not every instance of lipidemia leads to all known cardiovascular diseases. The specification fails to disclose how "normal' patients who are predisposed to these unnamed diseases would be identified and treated before developing the unnamed diseases.

It is quite possible that a mutation in the gene for the lipid metabolism or synthesis may lead to decrease or increase levels of HDL and/or LDL. To use the invention as claimed, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform experimentation in every instance to determine if the decrease or increase is due to genetic mutation in a patient or not. After prospective patients are identified and treated, assays must be performed on each one to determine if treatment is successful. However, the specification fails to disclose a routine procedure to perform such assays. Therefore, to make and use the instant invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform significant amount of experimentations. Such is deemed undue experiment under the US patent practice.

There are no disclosures in the specification establishing a link between the activities of the instant compounds and all known cardiovascular diseases, disorders capable of being treated or prevented by increasing HDL or decreasing LDL levels. There is no absolute predictability or established correlation between the claims and the specification disclosures. The uncertainty presents one of ordinary skill in the art with obstacles and prevents her from accepting the invention on its face. Predictability in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. In the instant invention, there is no direction or guidance by applicant because assays are not performed for establishing nexus between the assays' result and specific disorders. The specification several diseases but they are mere speculations because there is no conclusive evidence of relationships between the compounds and all known cardiovascular diseases, disorders capable of being treated or prevented by increasing HDL or decreasing LDL levels. Therefore, there is no evidence in the specification that established correlation between the disclosure and the instantly claimed invention. *See Ex parte Mass*, 9 USPQ2d 1746, (1987).

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "[a] conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding any of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. By limiting the disease to rheumatoid arthritis the rejection would be overcome.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 36, 56-57, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For the reasons set forth above under 35 USC 112, first paragraph the claims are indefinite. See the Examiner's suggestions above.

Objection

Claims 34, 36, 56-57 are objected to for depending from a subsequent claim. See the MPEP.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 58-69 are allowable over prior arts of record.

Related Patents

Numerous species are claimed in related patents, e.g. 6,699,910; 7,304,093; 7,119,221; 7,335,689 and 7,335,799. Applicant must delete such species form the instant claims.

Specification

There is no brief description of the drawing in the specification.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

/Taofiq A. Solola/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

September 25, 2008